

1441



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/849,715	05/04/2001	Bilhan Kirbas	42252-1003	9648

32968 7590 04/21/2006

KYOCERA WIRELESS CORP.

P.O. BOX 928289

SAN DIEGO, CA 92192-8289

EXAMINER

DANIEL JR, WILLIE J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/849,715

Applicant(s)

KIRBAS ET AL.

Examiner

Willie J. Daniel, Jr.

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-23,25-32 and 34-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-23,25-32 and 34-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to applicant's amendment filed on 14 November 2005. **Claims 21-23, 25-32, and 34-40** are now pending in the present application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The 112 rejections of the claims are withdrawn, as the proposed claim corrections are approved.

Claim Objections

3. The objection to the claims 25 is withdrawn, as the proposed claim correction is approved.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 21 and 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Irvin (US 6,556,819 B2)**.

Regarding **Claim 21**, Irvin a method for restricting communication in a mobile communication terminal (100) which reads on the claimed “wireless communications device” (see Figs. 2 and 4), comprising the steps of:

determining a physical location of the wireless communications device (100) utilizing a global positioning system (GPS) functional device (160) contained within the wireless communications device (see col. 4, lines 29-39; Fig. 4 “ref. 440”);

receiving (i.e., dialing) a phone number (i.e., digit) input into the wireless communications device (100) (see col. 3, lines 23-27, 37-42; col. 4, lines 22-28), where the user dials numbers (e.g., input numbers or digit string) using the keypad (108) of the mobile communication terminal (100) which is a typical process when making a phone call using a telephone (e.g., cellular phone). In addition, the user enters a command (e.g., SEND) to attempt (e.g., call origination) to connect with a calling party based on the dialed numbers (see col. 4, lines 22-28, 48-51). ;

utilizing a control unit (102) which reads on the claimed “controller” in the wireless communications device (100) for comparing the determined physical location with a plurality of authorized locations, the plurality of authorized locations (e.g., safe zone) pre-stored in a memory (170) of the wireless communications device (100) (see col. 6, lines 1-18,33-37; Fig. 4 “ref. 460”), where the control unit compares the terminal (100) to the safe zones; and

placing a phone call to the inputted phone number when the determined physical location matches an authorized location of the plurality of authorized locations (see col. 6, lines 3-39; col. 3, lines 39-42), where the phone is determined to be in a safe zone in which the placing of a call would be inherent for the dialing of a number.

Regarding **Claim 30**, Irvin a device (100) for restricting wireless communication (see Figs. 2 and 4), comprising:

a global positioning system (GPS) enabled device (160) for determining a physical location of the device (100) (see col. 4, lines 29-39; Fig. 4 “ref. 440”);

a keypad (108) which reads on the claimed “user interface” for inputting a phone number into the device (100) (see col. 3, lines 39-42; col. 4, lines 22-28; Fig. 2), where the user dials numbers via the keypad (108);

a memory (170) for pre-storing a plurality of authorized locations (e.g., safe zones) (see Fig. 2);

a controller (102) connected to the GPS enabled device (160), the user interface (108) and the memory (150), the controller (102) for determining if the determined physical location matches an authorized location of the plurality of authorized locations, the controller (102) outputting an indication of a match (see col. 6, lines 1-18,33-37; Fig. 4 “ref. 460”), where the control unit compares the terminal (100) to the safe zones; and

a transmitter (120) / receiver (140) which reads on the claimed “wireless communication circuit” connected to the controller (102) for initiating a phone call to the inputted phone number only if the controller (102) outputs the indication of the match (see col. 4, lines 11-28; col. 3, lines 39-42; Figs. 2, 4 “ref. 470”), where the user dials a number in which the location is checked to determine if the user is in a safe zone and whether or not to apply security measures.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Irvin (US 6,556,819 B2)** in view of **Kaplan (US 5,884,193)**.

Regarding **Claim 22**, Irvin discloses the feature wherein the step of placing a phone call comprises the step of:

placing the phone call to the inputted phone number when the determined physical location matches an authorized location (e.g., safe zone) of the plurality of authorized locations (see col. 6, lines 3-39; col. 3, lines 39-42), where the phone is determined to be in a safe zone in which the placing of a call would be inherent for the dialing of a number. Irvin fails to disclose having the features determining a phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number utilizing the controller in the wireless communications device; utilizing the controller for comparing the determined phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number with a plurality of authorized geographic characteristics stored in a memory of the wireless communications device; and when the determined phone number geographic characteristic matches an authorized geographic characteristic of the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics. However, the examiner maintains that the features determining a phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number utilizing the controller in the wireless communications device; utilizing the controller for comparing

Art Unit: 2617

the determined phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number with a plurality of authorized geographic characteristics stored in a memory of the wireless communications device; and when the determined phone number geographic characteristic matches an authorized geographic characteristic of the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics was well known in the art, as taught by Kaplan.

In the same field of endeavor, Kaplan discloses the features determining a phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number utilizing the controller in the wireless communications device (100) (see col. 5, lines 21-33; col. 6, lines 10-11; col. 6, line 67 - col. 7, line 2; col. 7, lines 64-66; col. 3, line 36-46; Figs. 1-2, 5B), where the system can store in the storage areas (e.g., ref. "130" "128") numbers such as telephone numbers (i.e., telephone numbers are mapped to an area code or particular geographic area) and/or area code (e.g., 800 numbers or 900 numbers) which are used for allowing/prohibiting calls (e.g., long distance);

utilizing the controller (102) for comparing the determined phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number with a plurality of authorized geographic characteristics stored in a memory (130) of the wireless communications device (100) (see col. 5, lines 14-18, 21-33; Figs. 1-2, 5B), where the CPU (102) of the wireless communication (100) compares the entered and stored numbers for matching; and

when the determined phone number geographic characteristic matches an authorized geographic characteristic of the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics (see col. 5, lines 21-33; col. 6, lines 10-11; col. 6, line 67 - col. 7, line 2; col. 7, lines 64-66; col. 3, line 36-46; Figs. 1-2, 5B), where the system can store in the storage areas (e.g., ref. "130" "128")

numbers such as telephone numbers (i.e., telephone numbers are mapped to an area code or particular geographic area) and/or area code (e.g., 800 numbers or 900 numbers) which are used for allowing/prohibiting calls (e.g., long distance).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Kaplan to have the features determining a phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number utilizing the controller in the wireless communications device; utilizing the controller for comparing the determined phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number with a plurality of authorized geographic characteristics stored in a memory of the wireless communications device; and when the determined phone number geographic characteristic matches an authorized geographic characteristic of the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics, in order to provide various levels of call restriction that can be selected by the user and implemented within the wireless communication device itself, as taught by Kaplan (see col. 3, lines 31-34, 42-45).

Regarding **Claim 23**, Irvin fails to disclose having the features wherein the determined phone number geographic characteristic comprises an area code, and wherein the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics comprises a plurality of authorized area codes. However, the examiner maintains that the features wherein the determined phone number geographic characteristic comprises an area code, and wherein the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics comprises a plurality of authorized area codes was well known in the art, as taught by Kaplan.

Kaplan further discloses the features

wherein the determined phone number geographic characteristic comprises an area code (see col. 5, lines 5-8, 57-63; col. 6, lines 10-11; Figs. 2 and 5B), and

wherein the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics comprises a plurality of authorized area codes (see col. 5, lines 5-8, 57-63; col. 6, lines 10-17; Figs. 2 and 5B).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Kaplan to have the feature s wherein the determined phone number geographic characteristic comprises an area code, and wherein the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics comprises a plurality of authorized area codes, in order to provide various levels of call restriction that can be selected by the user and implemented within the wireless communication device itself, as taught by Kaplan (see col. 3, lines 31-34, 42-45).

Claims 25-29, 31-32, and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Irvin (US 6,556,819 B2)** in view of **Rahikainen et al.** (hereinafter **Rahikainen**) (**US 6,085,080 B1**).

Regarding **Claim 25**, Irvin discloses the feature when the determined physical location does not match one of the plurality of authorized locations (see col. 6, lines 1-18, 33-60; Fig. 4 “ref. 460”), where the control unit compares position of the terminal (100) to the safe zones. Irvin fails to disclose having the feature not accepting an incoming phone call. However, the examiner maintains that the feature not accepting an incoming phone call was well known in the art, as taught by **Rahikainen**.

In the same field of endeavor, Rahikainen discloses the feature not accepting an incoming phone call (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B “ref. 14a”), where the WLL station (1) checks the incoming call against a reject list.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Rahikainen to have the feature not accepting an incoming phone call, in order to provide a flexible method of restricting calls and to allow the user the ability to selectively reject undesired incoming calls, as taught by Rahikainen (see col. 2, lines 30-41).

Regarding **Claim 26**, Irvin discloses a method for restricting communication in a wireless communications device (see Figs. 2 and 4), comprising the steps of:

determining a physical location of the wireless communications device utilizing a global positioning system (GPS) capable device (160) contained within the wireless communications device (100) (see col. 4, lines 29-39; Fig. 4 “ref. 440”);

utilizing a controller (102) in the wireless communications device (100) for comparing the determined physical location with a plurality of authorized locations, the plurality of authorized locations pre-stored in a memory (170) of the wireless communications device (100); and

when the determined physical location does not match one of the plurality of authorized locations (e.g., safe zones) (see col. 6, lines 1-18, 33-60; Fig. 4 “ref. 460”), where the control unit compares position of the terminal (100) to the safe zones. Irvin fails to disclose having the feature not accepting an incoming phone call. However, the examiner maintains that the

feature not accepting an incoming phone call was well known in the art, as taught by Rahikainen.

Rahikainen further discloses the feature not accepting an incoming phone call (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B “ref. 14a”), where the WLL station (1) checks the incoming call against a reject list.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Rahikainen to have the feature not accepting an incoming phone call, in order to provide a flexible method of restricting calls and to allow the user the ability to selectively reject undesired incoming calls, as taught by Rahikainen (see col. 2, lines 30-41).

Regarding **Claim 27**, Irvin as applied to claim 26, discloses a wireless communications device (see Figs. 2 and 4). As a note, Irvin teaches of dialing a phone number (see col. 3, lines 39-42; col. 4, lines 22-28; col. 6, lines 3-39), where the phone is determined to be in a safe zone in which the initiating of a phone call would be inherent for the dialing of a number. Irvin fails to disclose having the feature initiating a phone call to the inputted number if at least a portion of an inputted phone number matches at least one authorized geographic characteristic of a plurality of authorized geographic characteristics, the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics stored in a memory of the wireless communications device. However, the examiner maintains that the feature initiating a phone call to the inputted number if at least a portion of an inputted phone number matches at least one authorized geographic characteristic of a plurality of authorized geographic

characteristics, the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics stored in a memory of the wireless communications device was well known in the art, as taught by Rahikainen.

Rahikainen further discloses the feature initiating a phone call (e.g., outgoing call) to the inputted number if at least a portion of an inputted phone number matches at least one authorized geographic characteristic (e.g., number, prefix, or area code) of a plurality of authorized geographic characteristics, the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics stored in a memory (11b) of the wireless communications device (1) (see col. 5, lines 7-28, 33-37; Figs. 1, 2B “ref. 14a”), where comparator (14b) the WLL station (1) checks the outgoing/incoming calls against a reject list.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Rahikainen to have the feature initiating a phone call to the inputted number if at least a portion of an inputted phone number matches at least one authorized geographic characteristic of a plurality of authorized geographic characteristics, the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics stored in a memory of the wireless communications device, in order to provide a flexible method of restricting calls and to allow the user the ability to selectively reject undesired incoming calls, as taught by Rahikainen (see col. 2, lines 30-41).

Regarding **Claim 28**, Irvin discloses the feature and if the determined physical location matches one of the plurality of authorized locations (e.g., safe zones) (see col. 6, lines 1-18, 33-60; Fig. 4 “ref. 460”), where the control unit compares position of the terminal (100) to the safe zones. As a note, Irvin teaches of dialing a phone number (see col. 3, lines 39-42; col. 4, lines 22-28; col. 6, lines 3-39), where the phone is determined to be in a safe

zone in which the initiating of a phone call would be inherent for the dialing of a number.

Irvin fails to disclose having the feature initiating a phone call to the inputted number if the at least a portion of an inputted phone number matches at least one authorized geographic characteristic. However, the examiner maintains that the feature initiating a phone call to the inputted number if the at least a portion of an inputted phone number matches at least one authorized geographic characteristic was well known in the art, as taught by Rahikainen.

Rahikainen further discloses the feature initiating a phone call (e.g., outgoing call) to the inputted number if the at least a portion of an inputted phone number matches at least one authorized geographic characteristic (e.g., number, prefix, or area code) (see col. 5, lines 7-28, 33-37; Figs. 1, 2B “ref. 14a”), where comparator (14b) the WLL station (1) checks the outgoing/incoming calls against a reject list.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Rahikainen to have the feature initiating a phone call to the inputted number if the at least a portion of an inputted phone number matches at least one authorized geographic characteristic, in order to provide a flexible method of restricting calls and to allow the user the ability to selectively reject undesired incoming calls, as taught by Rahikainen (see col. 2, lines 30-41).

Regarding **Claim 29**, Irvin fails to disclose having the feature wherein the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics comprises a plurality of area codes, and wherein the at least a portion of the inputted number is an area code. However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics comprises a

Art Unit: 2617

plurality of area codes, and wherein the at least a portion of the inputted number is an area code was well known in the art, as taught by Rahikainen.

Rahikainen further discloses the feature wherein the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics comprises a plurality of area codes, and wherein the at least a portion of the inputted number is an area code (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B “ref. 14a”), where the WLL station (1) checks for a portion of the telephone number.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Rahikainen to have the feature wherein the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics comprises a plurality of area codes, and wherein the at least a portion of the inputted number is an area code, in order to provide a flexible method of restricting calls and to allow the user the ability to selectively reject undesired incoming calls, as taught by Rahikainen (see col. 2, lines 30-41).

Regarding **Claim 31**, Irvin discloses having the feature and outputs the indication of the match only if the determined physical location matches the authorized location (e.g., safe zones) (see col. 6, lines 1-18, 33-60; Fig. 4 “ref. 460”), where the control unit compares position of the terminal (100) to the safe zones. Irvin fails to disclose having the features wherein a plurality of authorized geographic characteristic are stored in the memory; wherein the controller determines a phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number; and wherein the controller compares the determined phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number to the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics and if the determined phone number geographic characteristic matches an authorized geographic characteristic of the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics.

However, the examiner maintains that the features wherein a plurality of authorized geographic characteristic are stored in the memory; wherein the controller determines a phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number; and wherein the controller compares the determined phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number to the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics and if the determined phone number geographic characteristic matches an authorized geographic characteristic of the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics was well known in the art, as taught by Rahikainen.

Rahikainen further discloses the features wherein a plurality of authorized geographic characteristic are stored in the memory (11b) (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B), where the WLL station (1) checks for a portion of the telephone number;

wherein the processor (11a) which reads on the claimed “controller” determines a phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B), where the telephone number is compared against the lists; and

wherein the controller (11a) compares the determined phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number to the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B), where controller (11a) processes data according to the comparator function (14a), and

if the determined phone number geographic characteristic matches an authorized geographic characteristic of the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B), where the WLL station (1) checks for a portion of the telephone number.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Rahikainen to have the features wherein a plurality of authorized geographic characteristic are stored in the memory; wherein the controller determines a phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number; and wherein the controller compares the determined phone number geographic characteristic of the inputted phone number to the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics and if the determined phone number geographic characteristic matches an authorized geographic characteristic of the plurality of authorized geographic characteristics, in order to provide a flexible method of restricting calls and to allow the user the ability to selectively reject undesired incoming calls, as taught by Rahikainen (see col. 2, lines 30-41).

Regarding **Claim 32**, Irvin fails to disclose having the features wherein a phone number geographic characteristic of the plurality of phone number geographic characteristics comprises at least one of an area code of a plurality of area codes and a set of numbers within an area codes of a plurality of sets of numbers within a plurality of area codes. However, the examiner maintains that the features wherein a phone number geographic characteristic of the plurality of phone number geographic characteristics comprises at least one of an area code of a plurality of area codes and a set of numbers within an area codes of a plurality of sets of numbers within a plurality of area codes was well known in the art, as taught by Rahikainen.

Rahikainen further discloses the features wherein a phone number geographic characteristic of the plurality of phone number geographic characteristics comprises at least one of an area code of a plurality of area codes and a set of numbers within an area codes of a

plurality of sets of numbers within a plurality of area codes (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B), where the WLL station (1) checks the telephone number and for a portion of the telephone number.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Rahikainen to have the features wherein a phone number geographic characteristic of the plurality of phone number geographic characteristics comprises at least one of an area code of a plurality of area codes and a set of numbers within an area codes of a plurality of sets of numbers within a plurality of area codes, in order to provide a flexible method of restricting calls and to allow the user the ability to selectively reject undesired incoming calls, as taught by Rahikainen (see col. 2, lines 30-41).

Regarding **Claim 34**, Irvin discloses a wireless communications device (100) (see Fig. 2), comprising:

a storage means (170) for storing a plurality of authorized locations, and a plurality of unauthorized locations (see Fig. 2), the device (100) can store position information. As a note, the teaches of seeing dialed digits (see col. 3, lines 37-42; col. 4, lines 11-28), where the device (100) can dial telephone numbers in which a common feature of phones is to store telephone numbers in a memory such as an address book;

an input means (108) for inputting a phone number into the wireless communications device (100) (see Fig. 2);

a global positioning system (GPS) means (160) for determining a physical location of the wireless communications device (100) (see Fig. 2);

the controller means (102) further determining if the determined physical location matches an authorized location (e.g., safe zones) of the plurality of authorized locations (e.g., safe zones) or an unauthorized location of the plurality of unauthorized locations, the controller means (102) for outputting a location match signal (see Figs. 2 and 4);

wireless communication circuit means (120/140) for placing a phone call to the inputted phone number based upon the outputted area code match signal and the outputted location match signal. Irvin fails to disclose having the features a storage means for storing a plurality of authorized area codes, a plurality of unauthorized area codes, a controller means for determining a particular area code of the inputted phone number, and for determining if the particular area code matches an authorized area code of the plurality of authorized area codes or an unauthorized area code of the plurality of unauthorized area codes, the controller means for outputting an area code match signal; wireless communication circuit means for placing a phone call to the inputted phone number based upon the outputted area code match signal. However, the examiner maintains that the features a storage means for storing a plurality of authorized area codes, a plurality of unauthorized area codes, a controller means for determining a particular area code of the inputted phone number, and for determining if the particular area code matches an authorized area code of the plurality of authorized area codes or an unauthorized area code of the plurality of unauthorized area codes, the controller means for outputting an area code match signal; wireless communication circuit means for placing a phone call to the inputted phone number based upon the outputted area code match signal was well known in the art, as taught by Rahikainen.

Rahikainen further discloses the features

a storage means (11b) for storing a plurality of authorized area codes, a plurality of unauthorized area codes (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B),

a controller means (11a) for determining a particular area code of the inputted phone number, and for determining if the particular area code matches an authorized area code of the plurality of authorized area codes or an unauthorized area code of the plurality of unauthorized area codes, the controller means (11a) for outputting an area code match signal (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B);

RF component (11f) which reads on the claimed “wireless communication circuit means” for placing a phone call to the inputted phone number based upon the outputted area code match signal (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Rahikainen to have the features a storage means for storing a plurality of authorized area codes, a plurality of unauthorized area codes, a controller means for determining a particular area code of the inputted phone number, and for determining if the particular area code matches an authorized area code of the plurality of authorized area codes or an unauthorized area code of the plurality of unauthorized area codes, the controller means for outputting an area code match signal; wireless communication circuit means for placing a phone call to the inputted phone number based upon the outputted area code match signal, in order to provide a flexible method of restricting calls and to allow the user the ability to selectively reject undesired incoming calls, as taught by Rahikainen (see col. 2, lines 30-41).

Regarding **Claim 35**, Irvin discloses the feature and the outputted location match signal indicates an authorized location (e.g., safe zone) (see Fig. 4). As a note, Irvin teaches of dialing a phone number (see col. 3, lines 39-42; col. 4, lines 22-28; col. 6, lines 3-39), where the phone is determined to be in a safe zone in which the placing of a phone call would be inherent for the dialing of a number. Irvin fails to disclose having the feature wherein the phone call is placed only if the outputted area code match signal indicates an authorized area code. However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the phone call is placed only if the outputted area code match signal indicates an authorized area code was well known in the art, as taught by Rahikainen.

Rahikainen further discloses the feature wherein the phone call is placed only if the outputted area code match signal indicates an authorized area code (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Rahikainen to have the feature wherein the phone call is placed only if the outputted area code match signal indicates an authorized area code, in order to provide a flexible method of restricting calls and to allow the user the ability to selectively reject undesired incoming calls, as taught by Rahikainen (see col. 2, lines 30-41).

Regarding **Claim 36**, Irvin discloses the feature or the outputted location match signal indicates an unauthorized location (e.g., safe zone) (see Fig. 4). As a note, Irvin teaches of dialing a phone number (see col. 3, lines 39-42; col. 4, lines 22-28; col. 6, lines 3-39), where the user dials a number in which the location is checked to determine if the user is in a safe

Art Unit: 2617

zone and whether or not to apply security measures. Irvin fails to disclose having the feature wherein the phone call is placed only if the outputted area code match signal indicates an authorized area code. However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the phone call is placed only if the outputted area code match signal indicates an authorized area code was well known in the art, as taught by Rahikainen.

Rahikainen further discloses the feature wherein the phone call is blocked if the outputted area code match signal indicates an unauthorized area code (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Rahikainen to have the feature wherein the phone call is placed only if the outputted area code match signal indicates an authorized area code, in order to provide a flexible method of restricting calls and to allow the user the ability to selectively reject undesired incoming calls, as taught by Rahikainen (see col. 2, lines 30-41).

Claims 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Irvin (US 6,556,819 B2)** in view of **Rahikainen et al. (hereinafter Rahikainen) (US 6,085,080 B1)** and **Schmidt (US 6,208,872 B1)**.

Regarding **Claim 37**, Irvin discloses a mobile communication system (10) which reads on the claimed “wireless communication network” for restricting communication of a wireless communications device (100), the wireless communication network (10) (see col. 2,

line 58 - col. 3, line 5; Figs. 1-4), where the system can activate and deactivate security features comprising:

a mobile communication system (10) which reads on the claimed “cellular service network” for accepting a phone call placed by the wireless communications device (100) (see col. 2, line 58 - col. 3, line 5; Figs. 1-4); and

the wireless communications device (100) (see Fig. 2) comprising:

a storage area (170) for storing at least one authorized geographic characteristic (e.g., safe zone) (see col. 6, lines 3-39; col. 3, lines 39-42; Fig. 4), where the control unit (102) of the terminal (100) compares the location (e.g., safe zone).

and at least one authorized location (e.g., safe zone) (see col. 6, lines 3-39; col. 3, lines 39-42; Fig. 4), where the control unit (102) of the terminal (100) compares the location (e.g., safe zone);

an input device (108) for inputting a phone number (see col. 3, lines 39-42; col. 4, lines 22-28; Fig. 2), where the user dials numbers via the keypad (108);

a global positioning system (GPS) function (160) for determining a physical location of the wireless communications device (100) (see col. 4, lines 29-39; Fig. 4 “ref. 440”);

a control unit (102) which reads on the claimed “processor” for performing a second comparison of the determined physical location to the at least one authorized location (e.g., safe zone) (see col. 6, lines 3-39; col. 3, lines 39-42; Fig. 4), where the control unit (102) of the terminal (100) the location (e.g., safe zone). As a note, Irvin teaches of dialing a phone number (see col. 3, lines 39-42; col. 4, lines 22-28; col. 6, lines 3-39), where the phone is determined to be in a safe zone therefore permitting the dialing of a number. Irvin further

discloses the control unit (102) enabling or disabling based on the compared location (see col. 6, lines 33-42, 58-59; col. 5, lines 31-34). Irvin fails to disclose having the features a processor for performing a first comparison of the inputted phone number to the at least one authorized geographic characteristic, and the processor outputting a place call signal or a block call signal based upon the results of the comparisons; and a wireless communication circuit connected to the processor, the wireless communication circuit for placing the phone call to the inputted phone number if the processor outputs the place call signal. However, the examiner maintains that the features a processor for performing a first comparison of the inputted phone number to the at least one authorized geographic characteristic, and the processor outputting a place call signal or a block call signal based upon a result of the first comparison and the second comparison; and a wireless communication circuit connected to the processor, the wireless communication circuit for placing the phone call to the inputted phone number if the processor outputs the place call signal was well known in the art, as taught by Rahikainen.

Rahikainen further discloses the feature a processor (11a) for performing a first comparison of the inputted phone number to the at least one authorized geographic characteristic (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B), and

a wireless communication circuit (11f) connected to the processor, the wireless communication circuit (11f) for placing the phone call to the inputted phone number if the processor (11a) outputs the place call signal (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B). Rahikainen further discloses the processor (11a) outputting a place call signal or a block call signal based upon a result of the comparisons (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Rahikainen to have the features a processor for performing a first comparison of the inputted phone number to the at least one authorized geographic characteristic; and a wireless communication circuit connected to the processor, the wireless communication circuit for placing the phone call to the inputted phone number if the processor outputs the place call signal, in order to provide a flexible method of restricting calls and to allow the user the ability to selectively reject undesired incoming calls, as taught by Rahikainen (see col. 2, lines 30-41). The combination of Irvin and Rahikainen does not specifically disclose having the feature the processor outputting a place call signal or a block call signal based upon a result of the first comparison and the second comparison. However, the examiner maintains that the feature the processor outputting a place call signal or a block call signal based upon a result of the first comparison and the second comparison was well known in the art, as taught by Schmidt.

In the same field of endeavor, Schmidt discloses the feature the processor (54) outputting a place call signal or a block call signal based upon a result of the first comparison and the second comparison (see col. 7, line 64 - col. 8, line 9; Figs. 1-5). As further support Schmidt also discloses the feature a wireless communication circuit connected to the processor (54), the wireless communication circuit for placing the phone call to the inputted phone number if the processor outputs the place call signal (see col. 7, line 64 - col. 8, line 9; Fig. 5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin, Rahikainen, and Schmidt to have

Art Unit: 2617

the feature the processor outputting a place call signal or a block call signal based upon a result of the first comparison and the second comparison, in order to allow a mobile station to allow or restrict incoming or outgoing calls, as taught by Schmidt (see col. 1, 54-62; abstract).

Regarding **Claim 38**, the combination of Irvin, Rahikainen, and Schmidt discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 37), in addition Irvin further discloses the wireless communication network (10) of claim 37, wherein the wireless communication device (100) further comprises a receiver circuit (140) for receiving an incoming phone call from the cellular service network only if the determined physical location matches the at least one authorized location (e.g., safe zone) (see col. 3, lines 39-42; col. 4, lines 22-28; col. 6, lines 3-39), where the control unit checks the location of the terminal (100) to determine if the user is in a safe zone and whether or not to apply security measures in which the receiver (140) receiving an incoming phone call would be inherent.

Regarding **Claim 39**, Irvin, as applied to claim 37 above, fails to disclose having the feature wherein the at least one authorized geographic characteristic comprises an area code. However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the at least one authorized geographic characteristic comprises an area code was well known in the art, as taught by Rahikainen.

Rahikainen further discloses the feature wherein the at least one authorized geographic characteristic comprises an area code (see col. 5, lines 7-28; Figs. 1, 2B).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin, Rahikainen, and Schmidt to have

Art Unit: 2617

the feature wherein the at least one authorized geographic characteristic comprises an area code, in order to provide a flexible method of restricting calls and to allow the user the ability to selectively reject undesired incoming calls, as taught by Rahikainen (see col. 2, lines 30-41).

Regarding **Claim 40**, the combination of Irvin, Rahikainen, and Schmidt discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 37), in addition Irvin further discloses wherein the cellular service network (10) controls the storage of the at least one authorized geographic characteristic (e.g., safe zone) and the at least one authorized location (e.g., safe zone) utilizing an over the air storage instruction to the wireless communications device (100) (see col. 4, lines 22-28; col. 6, lines 1-39).

Alternate Claims 25-26 Rejections:

Claims 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Irvin (US 6,556,819 B2)** in view of **Agness et al. (hereinafter Agness) (US 6,799,052 B1)**.

Regarding **Claim 25**, Irvin discloses the feature when the determined physical location does not match one of the plurality of authorized locations (see col. 6, lines 1-18, 33-60; Fig. 4 “ref. 460”), where the control unit compares position of the terminal (100) to the safe zones. Irvin fails to disclose having the feature not accepting an incoming phone call. However, the examiner maintains that the feature not accepting an incoming phone call was well known in the art, as taught by Agness.

In the same field of endeavor, Agness discloses the feature not accepting an incoming phone call (see col. 6, lines 21-25, 33-36; col. 8, lines 37-51; Fig. 2), where the cell phone

(13) has a GPS circuit (45) for determining the position which is used to restrict calls that are directed to the cell phone (13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Agness to have the feature not accepting an incoming phone call, in order to provide a transmission inhibit for digital handheld cell phones when at specified highway location and specified other restricted locations or during specified restricted times Agness (see col. 2, lines 38-41).

Regarding **Claim 26**, Irvin a method for restricting communication in a wireless communications device (see Figs. 2 and 4), comprising the steps of:

determining a physical location of the wireless communications device utilizing a global positioning system (GPS) capable device (160) contained within the wireless communications device (100) (see col. 4, lines 29-39; Fig. 4 “ref. 440”);

utilizing a controller (102) in the wireless communications device (100) for comparing the determined physical location with a plurality of authorized locations, the plurality of authorized locations pre-stored in a memory (170) of the wireless communications device (100); and

when the determined physical location does not match one of the plurality of authorized locations (e.g., safe zones) (see col. 6, lines 1-18, 33-60; Fig. 4 “ref. 460”), where the control unit compares position of the terminal (100) to the safe zones. Irvin fails to disclose having the feature not accepting an incoming phone call. However, the examiner maintains that the feature not accepting an incoming phone call was well known in the art, as taught by Agness.

Agness further discloses the feature not accepting an incoming phone call (see col. 6, lines 21-25, 33-36; col. 8, lines 37-51; Fig. 2), where the cell phone (13) has a GPS circuit (45) for determining the position which is used to restrict calls that are directed to the cell phone (13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Irvin and Agness to have the feature not accepting an incoming phone call, in order to provide a transmission inhibit for digital handheld cell phones when at specified highway location and specified other restricted locations or during specified restricted times Agness (see col. 2, lines 38-41).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 14 November 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's arguments as the applied reference(s) provide more than adequate support and to further clarify (see the above claims and comments in this section).

Regarding applicant's arguments of claim 21 on pg. 10, 1st paragraph, "...does not disclose...inputting a phone number," the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Irvine discloses receiving (i.e., dialing) a phone number (i.e., digit) input into the wireless communications device (100) (see col. 3, lines 23-27, 37-42; col. 4, lines 22-28), where the user dials numbers (e.g., input numbers or digit string) using the keypad (108) of the mobile communication terminal (100) which is a typical process when making a phone call using a telephone (e.g., cellular phone). In addition, the user enters a command (e.g., SEND) to attempt (e.g., call origination) to connect with a calling party based on the dialed numbers (see col. 4, lines 22-28, 48-51).

Regarding applicant's arguments of claim 21 on pg. 10, 2nd paragraph, "does not disclose...placing a phone call to the inputted phone number when the determined physical location matches an authorized location of the plurality of authorized locations...", the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Irvin discloses placing a phone call to the inputted (i.e., dialed) phone number when the determined physical location matches an authorized location (e.g., safe zones) of the plurality of authorized locations (e.g., safe zones) (see col. 6, lines 33-39, 58-59; col. 3, lines 39-42), where the control unit (102) compares the location of

Art Unit: 2617

phone (100) with locations (e.g., zones) stored in the memory (170) of the phone (100). If the phone is located within a safe zone, a call attempt (e.g., call origination) to the dialed number is processed without preventing transmitting (see col. 6, lines 33-39; col. 3, lines 23-27; col. 4, lines 48-51).

Regarding claims 22-40, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as set forth above in this section and as applied in each claim rejection.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
 - a. Valentine et al. (US 6,011,973) discloses "Method and Apparatus for Restricting Operation of Cellular Telephones to Well Delineated Geographical Areas".
 - b. Stephens (US 6,256,503 B1) discloses "Method and System in a Wireless Communications Network for Providing Restricted User Termination Areas Based on Originator Location".
8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory


period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Willie J. Daniel, Jr. whose telephone number is (571) 272-7907. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha D. Banks-Harold can be reached on (571) 272-7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

WJD,JR
13 April 2006


CHARLES APPIAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER